

WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM REDESIGN MEETING –Agenda –July 7, 2004

Location: In Person: SCR Hdqtrs, Gathering Waters Room, Present: Mike Degen, Connie Antonuk, Barb Hennings Larry Lynch, Dennis Mack, John Melby, Cynthia Moore, Deb Pingel, Sue Bangert, Dave Hildreth
 Note taker: Dave Hildreth

Time	Presenter	Topic		Decision	Followup
9:30 am	Sue B	Agenda Repair, Check-in		<p>Check in by all team members. Responded to general question of “how are we doing?”</p> <p>Most responses mentioned that we are making progress, but concerns about where this is all headed, when will we get to concrete, actionable recommendations, and that the timeline seems very ambitious when looking ahead at the work still needed.</p> <p>General feeling that we need to build more momentum.</p> <p>Rep. Johnsrud was unable to attend. We used that time period to discuss a new approach to obtaining Legislative input.</p>	
9:45	ALL	Updates: Focus/Staff input sessions; Bench-marking; Others		<p>INTERNAL/EXTERNAL INPUT SESSIONS.</p> <p>The first staff input session is today. Participation at the session is quite light. The facilitator offered to accept comments after the session from anyone at the session, and from those who didn’t attend. Our team should encourage better attendance at the next staff input session.</p> <p>How should we report and organize the comments from internal and external focus groups? We need to decide whether to summarize them separately, or include all</p>	<p>Each WMPR team member should contact their managers and/or their staff and stress the importance of providing input into this process. Encourage invited staff to attend the input sessions.</p> <p>The WMPR Stakeholder Input sub-team (Deb, Cynthia, Mike,</p>

			<p>input together in one table. There was some staff concern about the weight given to external input Vs internal comments. Having all input together was one way to make sure all input is treated the same.</p> <p>WMPR team will receive reports from Puntillo/McDermid for external sessions and from Bert Stitt for the internal sessions. WMPR team will need to provide a summary for the Web Site. Any HR related issues would be dealt with separately.</p> <p>BENCHMARKING</p> <p>Connie has shared material from Minnesota and Ohio. Larry is looking at Massachusetts and Washington. We also may want to look at New Jersey and Texas regarding multi-media permitting. Is any of this material useful to the team? Should we spend any more time on benchmarking other states?</p> <p>BUILDING BLOCKS DOCUMENT SUMMARIES</p> <p>Most of the summaries are completed. A couple need to be completed and forwarded to John.</p> <p>EXTERNAL FOCUS GROUPS</p> <p>Mark McDermid and Susan Puntillo are facilitating the external focus group. They will share summaries of the sessions with the participants prior to submitting a report to us. All external focus sessions will be completed prior to the August 11 WMPR meeting.</p>	<p>Dennis, & Sue) will work out the best way to structure an efficiently review the input data at the next WMPR meeting.</p> <p>We will put this on the agenda for the August 11 meeting. Connie and Larry will lead a discussion regarding what we have learned from the other states. And, can we apply anything from the other States to our redesign planning effort.</p> <p>John will distribute the summaries to team member for our review prior to the August 11 meeting. Place this on the agenda for August 11.</p> <p>Discussion of the external focus group reports will be added to the August 11 agenda.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>REVIEW AND USE PROBLEM STATEMENT/GOAL/CRITERIA</p> <p>Remembering the importance of the RR Vision Statements to their program, we discussed putting the WMPR Problem statement, goal, and criteria up on the board during our future meetings. That would help keep us focused as we move forward with development of the redesign plan. Questions were raised regarding the relationship of the above mentioned WMPR direction with the existing Program Vision from the EMS work and WA Program Purpose and Goals on the WA intranet site. There was some general agreement that the WMPR goals/criteria were developed for this process, while the EMS Vision was more to look at overall areas for additional emphasis in the program and not intended to cover everything we do in the program. How the Program Purpose & Goals connect with the EMS Vision and WMPR direction wasn't fully discussed.</p>	<p>At the August 11 WMPR meeting we will review the Problem Statement, Goal Statement, and Criteria to see if any revisions are needed. We will put the above items on the board to help guide our work on the Redesign Plan. We will resolve any remaining concerns about the relationship of the EMS Vision, Program Purpose & Goals, and the above WMPR documents.</p>
10:00	Frank Schultz, ALL	Discussion on "Stakeholders' WA Program Redesign Ideas" Table:		Didn't get to this agenda item.	
11:00	Rep. Johnsrud	Discussion, during Lunch, with Rep. Johnsrud on Waste Management Issues, Vision, Political Context		<p>No Legislators were able to attend the meeting. It has been difficult to get any commitment from Legislators to do so. Maybe we should change our approach and offer to have a small group go to the selected Legislators office to gather input. This might allow us to reach a wider diversity of Legislators for a more balanced view of our program. This approach will also allow us to provide I&E to the individuals, and determine whether a Legislator(s) have an interest in working closely with us in the future...i.e. looking for advocates like those helping the RR program.</p>	<p>Cynthia, Larry, and Connie will lead this effort. Materials to use at the Legislator meetings will need to be developed.</p>

1:00 PM	BREAK				
1:15	Mike Degen, Dennis Mack, ALL	Discussion & Decision: ‘Things to Consider Doing’ How to proceed with these activities: Should other activities be added? Should we proceed with any of these activities? Timing? WaMT input?		<p>We reviewed a draft paper from Mike that included a few paragraphs to explain what the list is and how it will be used. We reviewed that language and suggested some minor clarifications. The document also included the ideas we have generated so far, and some additional details regarding each item. We decided that the best way to deal with these potential opportunities would be to put develop a matrix to assist us in deciding what to do with each idea. We completed the matrix for each idea...a draft is included below.</p> <p><u>“Things to Consider Doing”</u> This is a “living document” that can be modified as new ideas are developed, when conditions change, etc. We will develop an issue paper of those items recommended for further consideration. The issue paper will then go to the WaMT.</p>	Assignments were made to WMPR team members to develop issue papers on the recommended ideas and share with the WMPR by July 28. We will have a conference call on August 2 to review the issue papers. Issue papers will be reviewed at a WaMT meeting on August 12...switched from a conference call to a face to face meeting.
2:00	Sue Bangert, ALL	Discussion on how we are proceeding with the Redesign and Timeline. Discussion on Mission.		We ran out of time before reaching this topic.	Move to next meeting.
2:45	ALL	Next Steps & Assignments		There is a lot to do over the next few weeks. We will need to add conference calls or meetings to keep the process moving. Also encourage all WMPR team members to attend the Aug 11 meeting in person, rather than via conference phone.	Added a conference call on Aug. 2, a meet with WaMT on August 12, and a WMPR meeting on August 20. We will also hold the already scheduled WMPR meeting on Aug. 11.
3:00		Adjourn			

THINGS TO CONSIDER DOING

IDEA	GUT CHECK	Criteria					SUPPORT PROG. GOALS	LT or ST	ASSIGNMENT	WMPR TEAM RECOMM.	WaMT ACTION
		#1	#2	#3	#4	#5					
Green Tier	Worth further consideration	Poss	Y	Y –I (in-direct)	ST=N LT=Y	Y	Y	Both	Mike, Dave	Pursue Pilot(s)	
Single Approval for Companies with Multiple Facilities	Complex issue; consider later?, better for LT?	ST=N LT=Y	Y	Y-I	Y	Y	Y	Both	Dennis, Larry, Frank	Form small group to explore pilot	
Change needs law for 15 to 25 years	Beyond our stated short-term goals							LT			
Understanding and controlling “unit costs”	Recognize need for data; not immediate action							Both			
Cooperative partnership with counties/regional entities (shared responsibilities w/ other entities, cooperative agreements)	Need, no immediate short term action							LT			
DNR Plan Review, incl. PR streamlining	For LF too complex							LT		Take credit for plan review streamlining underway; test waters with PR streamlining on non-LF approvals	
IT – SHWIMS/RCY web based reporting, plan approvals on WEB	Makes sense	Poss	Y	Y-I	Y	Y	Y	Both	Sue, John S., Chris Carlson	Form small group	
Evaluate LF Plan Review Process, incl. Value-added efficiencies, skill sets	Inconclusive	Y	Y	Y-I	Y	Y	Maybe	LT, ST?	Sue, Barb, Connie, Advisor – Dennis	Sue to check on this further with ‘idea-generator’; get with small group	
Recycling – 4 haulers take respon to inspect MRFs (self-certification inspection) - broaden to include “value” of inspection	Has short term potential; need ideas for incentives for haulers	Y	Y	Y-I	Y	Prob	Y	Both	Cynthis, Deb, Larry	Form group to develop incentives	
Low-hazard exemption (can we broaden the # of statewide LHE used in WI)	Already doing	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Both	John M, Paul K, Advisors – Deb and Dave	John – poll staff to add; doesn’t need to go to WAMT; do off-line	
Single permit for all media	Complex, time consuming; not for immediate consideration in LT review action							LT			